

 You forwarded this message on 6/21/2006 1:56 PM.

Attachments can contain viruses that may harm your computer. Attachments may not display correctly.

**Toni Washington**

**From:** Quick, Polly [PQuick@icfi.com]

**Sent:** Sun 5/28/2006 3:51 PM

**To:** Toni Washington

**Cc:** Fukudome, Marie

**Subject:** late request for a DIRS number

**Attachments:**  Notes on Visual Resources Discussion.doc(58KB)

MOL.20060629.0154

QA:N/A

Hi Toni, in revising Section 4.4, I find that I need to reference the attached set of notes that I authored and that were circulated after the March meetings with BLM. So this would be a "Quick 2006" reference. I will be traveling all of Tuesday and out of touch most of Wednesday – could you and Marie work to get this into the system? Thanks, Polly

Polly McW. Quick, Ph.D.

Principal

ICF International

60 Broadway

San Francisco, CA 94111

+1 415.677-7115

Internal ICF system: 47115

+1 415 677-7177 fax

+1 510 703-7396 cell

pquick@icfi.com

<https://xmail.phe.com/exchange/toni.washington/Inbox/late%20request%20for%20a%20DIRS%20number....> 6/21/2006

Meeting Notes Taken By Polly Quick on Visual Resources Discussion at Ely BLM Office, Ely, NV -3/15/06

Alan Buehler, Tonopah BLM  
Jack Tribble, Ely BLM  
Robert Mussler, Booz-Allen  
Gene Allen, NRP (? Or BSC?)

J Tribble asked if would need more photos for GV-8. We don't think so, will add GV-8 to existing simulations.

Alan Buehler says he expects most potential for visual impacts in Tonopah district will be approaches to Warm Springs summit from both sides, and also coming down 95 towards Beatty.

AB asked also about views from WSAs. PQ said we didn't take any from within WSAs and JT says case law supports that - you only go as far as the boundary of the special area (for visual). That is, KOP should be outside WSA, not inside. AB says we need to draw the lines more clearly on Figs 3.4-2 and 3.4-3 in Reveille Valley area - line makes it look as if alignment crosses Class II land here.

Indian Cove Yard discussion. GA: Would fill the entire flat area with track, and there would be trains sitting there, also visible, in addition to buildings. We talked about screening with trees but agreed that trees themselves are a contrast with existing landscape. Tribble says maybe just leave as is - the effect would be to extend the industrial feel from Caliente a bit further. If we keep Indian Cove Yard in the document, would be good to have a KOP at south end as well.

Re conveyor across highway at Indian Cove. Gene thinks maximum use for rail construction would be 2 years (we say 4 years in DEIS now). But there could be shared use for 8-10 years until the deposit it exhausted. Need to mention this in the discussion of Shared Use, as we don't see any operations impacts under Proposed Action.

Re Upland Yard. JT: Need a KOP from south end - and simulations for both north and south views [if this is going to be the preferred alternative]. Also need something that will show the conveyor here. From south, yard will be more visible. Both for this and the north end shot, shoot from yard side of highway.

Too much of this and some of the other baseline shots are filled with highway, not the feature of interest. Need to have feature of interest in the foreground. Generally, BLM tries to shoot from the perspective of a vehicle driver who is in the center of the highway looking toward the feature while driving by.

93 crossing. GA says will be road over rail. JT says we should do a simulation of that.

In appendix, M-1 and M-2 are not distant and closeup of same shot – are from same KOP, but M-1 in a shot NE (Burnt Springs Range in front, Chief Range in back) and M-2 is a shot NW – on right is Highland Range, on left is probably south end of Schell. On M-1, alignment will probably be behind Burnt Springs Range.

JT: need KOP that shows crossing of 318, with a simulation of the rail over road. Also a shot that follows it to SW showing crossing of White River – want a simulation here and as it climbs the slope. Wonders if crossing would be very visible when one emerges from S-curve on 318 coming north – both PQ and GA said crossing is much further north than that.

In reviewing shots of GV, JT emphasized that we want to show the views that are where the line is closest to KOP. E.g., M-14 view from county road over GV-2 at 2000 feet. Is there a similar view from City across GV-2 at 2000 feet? Where we have trains in simulations, put them at the closest point on the photo – in some shots they appear at greatest distance. JT suggests using GIS plots to identify segments where alignment is closest to City and closest to county roads. These will be segments where the contrast caused by alignment is moderate because it is close enough that either the track or a train, or both, will draw attention of viewer. Even if this is short duration, if it draws attention, it does not meet Class II objectives.

JT says it is possible to engineer away the moderate contrast in these situations: e.g., use vegetated berms or low hills; for the every-five-mile towers and buildings [which we need to add to the description of common impacts and to Chap 2], could use blending colors on the buildings and towers. The cost of designing the specific mitigations (DOE engineers working with BLM specialists who know the sensitivities) is probably more than the cost of executing them. He thinks we should use language in the DEIS that says DOE will do the necessary mitigations to meet the Class II objectives – specify the segments (and total length of each) that will require the mitigation even if we can't specify the precise mitigation for each segment.

Other KOPs/simulations requested by AB: from Hwy 6 coming up to Warm Springs summit from east that show cuts and fills – closer to summit than M-23. I think we have the baseline shots – need to get the DEMs and ask the simulator to do the work.

Add a simulation of a train on M-30.

For M-32, substitute a KOP that is directly on Hwy 95 looking east to Stonewall Mtn, plus track, plus train

For M-33, substitute a KOP that is directly on Hwy 95.

Instead of M-34 as is, show an actual cut – do a simulation or show an example that is close to highway. AB likes this location to show a simulated cut, because it is very close to hwy 95. Ask simulator if he can do a sim here, using cut shots from Dave Wehner.

If there is a curve near either the 318 or 93 crossing, get a view from curve to the crossing  
- because crossing will be more noticeable than when viewed straight on.

In discussion of affected environment, JT says just use the classifications in preferred alternative of Ely RMP, because the new inventory has taken place, no matter what alternative is ultimately adopted. PQ asks about why so much more Class II around Caliente. He says the inventory takes into account current conditions – many more people living around Caliente than in 1984, more demand for public lands.

Also says that PQ's extrapolation of Class II to the private lands around Caliente is incorrect – they have buildings, power lines, conditions that would not support a Class II. PQ should correct that in DEIS, and that reduces the concern about effects of Indian Cove and Upland yards.

JT suggestions on how to discuss impacts: in chapter 4, be specific: say that viewer will see a linear impact that can only be mitigated to a class X objective. Where can't get to a Class II, talk about mitigation that will get it to a Class III objective. E.g., in Garden Valley, where line is close to a county road (and maybe in Timber Mountain Pass where close to a county road), there will be an impact – can't meet the Class II objective without mitigation– specify the segments where this is the case, get a total mileage. Then talk about possible mitigations: spray paint patina on ballast; match fill color to surroundings [shouldn't be hard, as fill will come from local cuts]; build berms and vegetate with local vegetation; camouflage bungalows; towers will be hardest.

JT would like to see any alternative or option removed from DEIS (along with associated KOPs and simulations) that has been eliminated by DOE. E.g, Eccles yard, Eccles interchange, Indian Cove yard, no power lines along alignment....

Correct fill color in M-31 simulation of 95 crossing – it will not be so contrasting

Questions raised by info from GA needing verification:

Caliente ballast conveyor – in use for 2 years or 4 years for construction?

Electric power along route – has decision been made to underground the line?

Construction camps – what is area of footprint with the added sidings?

- What is realistic scenario of use? All built in first year, but housing closed after earthwork done, with mobile housing brought in for track work?

Highway crossings: verify that 93 and 375 are road over rail, 318 is rail over road

New KOPs requested:

- Upland yard, shot from south, and reshoot from north – both from yard side of highway; also a shot that will show where ballast conveyor will cross
- KOP at south end of Indian Cove Yard if it will stay in DEIS
- Move KOPs from 266 and 267 to Hwy 95.

- Crossing of 93, get a good shot for a simulation of road over rail crossing, from a curve if possible
- Crossing of 318, get a good shot for simulation of rail over road crossing, also shots to show rail as it crosses white river and heads up slope to approach the area where we show the simulation on Timber Mtn.
- Possibly a shot where county road on Timber Mtn pass is near alignment (this is a class II area being crossed by alignment, would be visible to users of the county road even if not particularly noticeable from 318)
- If prior shots from Hwy 6 near wm springs summit on east side are not useable for simulation that shows cuts/fills, need another KOP here